

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of November 13, 2008, claims 1-15 are rejected and objected to. In response, claims 1, 3-8, 11 and 12 have been amended and new claims 16-19 have been added. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at Applicant's specification, for example, original claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled. Support for claim 16 is found at Applicant's specification, for example, page 5, lines 29-31. Support for claim 17 is found at Applicant's specification, for example, page 7, lines 1-3. Support for claim 18 is found at Applicant's specification, for example, original claims 1 and 4. Support for new claim 19 is found at Applicant's specification, for example, original claims 1 and 5. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments, the new claims, and the below-provided remarks.

### Claim Objections

Claims 1-15 are objected to as allegedly being narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current U.S. practice. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-8, 11 and 12 to remove reference numbers and to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors. Additionally, Applicant has canceled claim 2. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1-15 be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tsubaki et al. (EP 1109251 A1, hereafter "Tsubaki"). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsubaki in view of Adam et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,025, hereafter "Adam"). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsubaki. In response, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 16-19 have been added. As noted above, claim 2 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over Tsubaki and Adam for the reasons provided below.

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the claim objection. Claim 1 has also been amended to include “*wherein the switching means is part of the antenna configuration,*” which is recited in part in original claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled. As amended, claim 1 recites:

“Antenna configuration for a telecommunication device, wherein the antenna configuration comprises a first resonator structure, a second resonator structure, and a control electrode, wherein said two resonator structures are capacitive coupled to one another, said control electrode being provided and realized for changing the capacitive coupling between the first resonator structure and the second resonator structure, and the control electrode being contactable from outside the antenna configuration, wherein a switching means is associated with the control electrode, by means of the switching means the control electrode being connectable to a reference potential, wherein the switching means is part of the antenna configuration.”  
(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully asserts that Tsubaki fails to disclose that “the switching means is part of the antenna configuration” (emphasis added) as recited in amended claim 1. Tsubaki discloses that a switch (19) is external to a basic body (11) of an antenna unit (10), see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0028]. In particular, one end of the switch (19) is connected to a control electrode (18) and the other end of the switch (19) is grounded. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the basic body (11) includes a grounding electrode 12, a first microstrip antenna (10a), and a second microstrip antenna (10b). That is, the basic body (11) is an antenna configuration. Thus, the switch (19) is external to the antenna configuration of the basic body (11).

Because Tsubaki fails to disclose that “the switching means is part of the antenna configuration” (emphasis added) as recited in amended claim 1, Tsubaki fails to disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Tsubaki.

### Dependent Claims 3-15

Claims 3-8, 11 and 12 has been amended to overcome claim objections. Claims 3-15 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3-15 are allowable at least based on an

allowable claim 1. Additionally, claim 5 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Claim 5 recites in part “*the second resonator structure, by means of the dielectric substrate being electrically isolated from the first resonator structure*” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully asserts that Tsubaki fails to disclose the above-identified limitation.

Tsubaki discloses that a first radiation electrode (13) and a second radiation electrode (14) are connected to a grounding electrode (12), see Fig. 1 and paragraph [0027]. In particular, Tsubaki discloses that the first radiation electrode (13) is connected to the grounding electrode (12) through a first connecting electrode (15) and the second radiation electrode (14) is connected to the grounding electrode (12) through a second connecting electrode (16). Because the first radiation electrode (13) and the second radiation electrode (14) are both connected to ground, the first radiation electrode (13) and the second radiation electrode (14) are not electrically isolated. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Tsubaki fails to disclose the above-identified limitation.

Because Tsubaki fails to disclose “*the second resonator structure, by means of the dielectric substrate being electrically isolated from the first resonator structure*” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 5, Tsubaki fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 5. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 5 is patentable over Tsubaki.

#### New claims 16-19

New claims 16 and 17 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 16 and 17 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claims 16 and 17 may be allowable for further reasons, as described below.

New claim 16 recites in part “*the resonance frequency is changed in discrete steps, wherein the resonance frequency is changed a fixed amount in each of the discrete steps.*” Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 16 is patentable over and not anticipated by the cited references because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the above-identified limitation.

New claim 17 recites in part “*the dielectric substrate includes multiple sintered layers of ceramic foils.*” Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 17 is patentable over and not anticipated by the cited references because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the above-identified limitation.

Independent claims 18 and 19 have been added. New claim 18 recites in part “*wherein the antenna configuration is realized by means of a planar inverted F antenna or a stub antenna.*” Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 18 is patentable over and not anticipated by the cited references because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the above-identified limitation.

New claim 19 includes all of the limitations of original claims 1 and 5. Claim 19 includes similar limitations to claim 5. Because of the similarities between claim 5 and claim 19, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 5 apply also to claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 19 is patentable over Tsubaki and Adam.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments, the new claims, and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Heiko Pelzer

Date: January 27, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham

PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road

San Jose, CA 95132

Phone: (925) 249-1300

Fax: (925) 249-0111